

## REMARKS

Claims 1-27 remain pending in the application and stand rejected as being unpatentable over Masaki (US Patent No. 5,940,571).

The office action objected to the drawings as failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicants traverse the objection. The examiner's objection is akin to requiring dimensions in drawings of a mechanical device or component values in an electrical schematic. Such is clearly not required by Office rules. The drawings do illustrate multiple structures formed in each of the various optical elements depicted in the drawings, and these optical structures are clearly described as having differing characteristic values, such as amplitude, pitch, aspect ratio, etc., based upon the location of the optical structure on the optical element. However, in an effort to move the application forward, applicant proposes changes to Figs. 2-10 to show a generically represented first value and a generically represented second value for various physical characteristics of the optical structures at first and second locations on the optical element. Inherently the first value is at a first location of the film and the second value is at a second location of the film, and hence a first and a second value are illustrated at first and second locations. Photocopies of the drawings illustrating the proposed changes in circled regions to be viewable in the facsimile transmission accompany this response. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

In the office action, claims 1-27 are rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Masaki. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The examiner acknowledges that Masaki fails to teach each and every element of applicants' claimed invention, and particularly notes that Masaki fails to teach the characteristic of the optical structures having a first value at a first predetermined

location and a second value at a second predetermined location. In fact, nowhere does Masaki disclose, teach or suggest such physical characteristics for optical structures formed in an optical element. For at least this reason, applicants submit the invention as claimed is patentable over Masaki.

The examiner points to several passages in Masaki as teaching the optical structure as having a first value or "maximum measured value" for a first predetermined location and a second value or "minimum measured value" for a second predetermined location of a transmissive film. The examiner is referencing a light output measurement of the film, not a physical characteristic of the film. Variation in the light output of an optical element, which may be referred to as non-uniformity, is a well-known, unwanted aspect of lightguide structures. However, because the light output of the Masaki structure demonstrates non-uniformity does not lead to the conclusion that Masaki has taught, disclosed or even suggested the physical properties of an optical element claimed by applicants'. In fact, Masaki has not taught such a structure.

Applicants have carefully studied the disclosure of Masaki. Masaki does not teach a turning film, a lightguide slab, a lens, or any other optical element formed with optical structures arranged in a pattern, wherein each optical structure has a physical characteristic, such as an amplitude, period or aspect ratio, and wherein the characteristic has a first value at a first location and a second value at a second location on the film. At best, Masaki teaches a tapered lightguide, i.e., a single optical structure, but not plural optical structures that differ in their physical characteristics as claimed by applicants. As such, applicants submit their claims are allowable over Masaki and such action is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit the application as a whole is in a condition for allowance, and such action is requested at the examiner's earliest convenience. The examiner is encouraged to contact applicants' undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this response or the application as a whole.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the fee required by the requested extension of time, and any fee deficiency required to submit this paper, or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-2855. A copy of this paper accompanies this submission.

Respectfully Submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN &  
BORUN  
6300 Sears Tower  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6402  
(312) 474-6300

By



Anthony G. Sitko  
Reg. No. 36,278  
Attorneys for Applicants

January 15, 2002

FAX COPY RECEIVED

JAN 15 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**